

REMARKS

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed May 11, 2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner maintained the Restriction Requirement of February 4, 2005; objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a); rejected claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2; and rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atobe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,350,138) in view of Kanesashi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,872,083). The Examiner further indicated that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of claim 1, and amended to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claim 4.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application, of which claims 1-4 are presented for examination.

At the outset, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's Restriction Requirement for reasons set forth in their Response to Restriction Requirement dated March 4, 2005.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended the specification and claims 1-4 for consistency and to improve readability. The specification and claims 1-4 have been amended to improve general readability. Applicants have also amend claim 4 to be in independent form, and thus claim 4 is deemed to be allowable.

The amendment of claim 2 to recite "a portion of said pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via one or more of the openings" finds

support, for example, in Figure 9 (showing openings in cover member 30 and socket body 20) and in the specification at page 27, line 25 - page 28, line 3. Figures 1-7 further support this claim amendment.

The recitation of “a position in which said touch portion of said pressing member does not contact said semiconductor device” is supported, for example, by Figures 1 and 5. As illustrated in Figure 5, for example, touch portion 26T of pressing member 26 can occupy a position wherein touch portion 26T does not contact semiconductor device 36. See *also*, e.g., page 26, lines 7-18 of the specification.

As amended, claims 3 and 4 recite “a first touch portion” “coupled to said first proximal end” and “a second touch portion coupled to said second proximal end.” The specification supports these recitations, for example, at page 25, lines 1-7, which describes the “coupling section 26C,” which couples the proximal end section of exemplary pressing member 26 to touch portion 26T. As explained, for example, at page 24, lines 22-27 of the specification, pressing members 26 and 28 are identical to one another. Figures 3-5 provide further exemplary support for this claim language.

Objections to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). In particular, the Examiner stated that the “touch portion formed at the proximal end” and “cover member and the socket body having openings so that a portion of said pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via the openings” “must be shown (and numbered) or the feature cancelled from the

claims.” See Office Action at 2 (emphasis in original). Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the drawings.

As amended, claims 3 and 4 recite “a first touch portion” “coupled to said first proximal end” and “a second touch portion coupled to said second proximal end.” The drawings illustrate these elements, for example, in Figures 1-5. Figure 3, for example, shows that pressing member 26 includes a proximal end section 26E, a touch portion 26T, and a coupling section 26C, which couples touch portion 26T to proximal end section 26E. Moreover, as shown in Figures 1 and 2, for example, pressing member 28 contains similar structures as pressing member 26. Thus, the drawings illustrate examples of the elements recited in the claims, as amended, and therefore satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

As to the claimed “cover member and the socket body having openings so that a portion of said pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via the openings,” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s requirement that these features must be numbered in the drawings. 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), which forms the basis of the Examiner’s objection, states that “[t]he drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.” MPEP § 608.02(d). This provision requires only that the drawings “show,” not “number” every claimed feature. Figure 9, for example, shows an embodiment in which both cover member 30 and socket body 20 have openings and “a portion of said pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via the openings.” Figures 1-7 provide further exemplary illustrations of openings in cover 30 and socket body 20. Figure 3, for example, shows portions 26T and 26C of pressing member 26 bulging

through openings in socket body 20 and cover member 30. Thus, the drawings, as originally filed, comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for this reason also.

Rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. The rejected claims are sufficiently definite “to ensure that the scope of the claims is clear so the public is informed of the boundaries of what constitutes infringement of the patent.” See MPEP § 2173.

In particular, claim 2, as amended, requires that “said cover member and said socket body have openings, respectively, so that when said cover member causes said touch portion of said pressing member to move to a position in which said touch portion of said pressing member does not contact said semiconductor device, a portion of said pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via one or more of the openings.” Amended claim 2, therefore, satisfies 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 3 and 4, as amended, recite a first pressing member and a second pressing member. The first and second pressing members have “a first touch portion ... coupled to said first proximal end” and “a second touch portion coupled to said second proximal end,” respectively. Applicants submit that these claims also comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that their changes to claims 2-4 obviate the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.

Rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-3 as being unpatentable over Atobe et al. in view of Kanesashi. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, among other requirements, the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim elements. See MPEP § 2143.

Atobe et al. and Kanesashi, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all elements of the claimed invention. In particular, the applied references at least fail to teach or suggest "a portion of said pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via an opening of said socket body," as recited in claim 11.

As illustrated in Figures 1(a)-1(c) of Atobe et al., Atobe et al. neither teaches nor suggests an opening in a socket body. Indeed, base 2 contains no such opening. Moreover, no portion of latch 25, which the Examiner alleges corresponds to the claimed pressing member, bulges outwardly from an end of base 2 in the Atobe et al. reference. The Examiner points to no portion of latch 25 that "is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via an opening of said socket body," as claim 1 requires, (See Office Action at 4-5), and no figure or textual disclosure in the reference suggests this element. Atobe et al. thus fails to teach or suggest that "a portion of said pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via an opening of said socket body," as recited in claim 1.

Kanesashi fails to cure the above-described deficiencies of Atobe et al. Like Atobe et al., Kanesashi does not teach an opening in said socket body or that a pressing member is “bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body,” as recited in claim 1. Indeed, the Examiner does not rely on Kanesashi for such teachings. Rather, as illustrated in Figure 1 of Kanesashi, neither jig body 48 nor base plate 34 allows for a pressing member to bulge outwardly via an opening in the socket body.

Accordingly, even if Atobe et al. and Kanesashi were combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the purported combination would fail to teach the elements of claim 1 discussed above. As Atobe et al., Kanesashi, and their purported combination fail to teach or suggest that “a portion of said pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via an opening of said socket body,” claim 1 is allowable over these references for at least this reason.

Claim 3 is allowable at least due to its dependence from claim 1. In addition, claim 2, while differing in scope from claim 1, recites that “a portion of said pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via one or more of the openings” and “a portion of said first pressing member is bulged outwardly from an end of said socket body via an opening of said socket body,” respectively. Applicants submit that claim 2 is thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 10, 2005

By: 
for Reg. No. 34,731
John M. Romary
Reg. No. 26,331